

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-32 remain active in this case, Claims 1, 5, 9, 12, 15-17, 21, 25, 28, 31 and 32 having been amended by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1, 5, 9, 12, 15-17, 21, 25, 28, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kay (6,021,266). The remaining Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 18-20, 22-24, 26, 27, 29 and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. However, in view of the present amendment made to clarify the claimed invention stated in the independent claims, the allowable dependent claims have presently been maintained in dependent form.

Turning now to the rejection on the merits, the applied Kay patent describes converting a high-level language such as a C-like software language into an HDL (Hardware Description Language). This high-level supports parallelism. In that sense, the object of Applicant's invention is similar to that of the Kay patent, which is to convert a parallel program written in Spec C language into a hardware model. In that regard, the Kay patent at column 10, lines 7-9 states the object in more detail, noting that "Where the same variable is accessed from two different parallel components, the behavior is undefined unless all the accesses are re-only."

The outstanding Office Action relies on the Kay patent as disclosing a configuration which is configured to convert a first code (Spec C) into a second code (HDL) by using a

generator module 11, a simplifier module 6, an optimizer 10, etc. The configuration analyzes a source code, creates an abstract syntax tree and a symbol table, and detects parallel procedures on the basis of the abstract syntax tree and the symbol table. In addition, the outstanding Office Action relates the Figure 4a disclosure of Kay to the value solving process of Applicant's invention.

However, Applicant points out that the R-expressions 32 shown in Figure 4a of the Kay patent do not correspond to the value solving process of Applicant's invention. At page 19, lines 20-23 of Applicant's specification, it is stated, "In each Architecture, signals subjected to assignment from a plurality of processes and port_map are detected." The Kay patent does not describe such feature, as accentuated in the amended claims. Furthermore, the outstanding Office Action does not address the claimed feature of assigning values to a predetermined shared variable. In view of these distinctions, it is Applicant's view that the amended claims patentably define over the Kay patent.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussions, it is respectfully submitted that the pending amended claims patentably define over the prior art and are in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
EHK/bwt

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\219061US-AM.DOC